

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

PIN: 6766
APPLICANT NAME: Kaweah Delta Water Conservation District
PROJECT TITLE: Regional Water Management Implementation Program 2005-06
FUNDS REQUESTED: \$14,695,600
COST MATCH: \$ 1,633,100
TOTAL PROJECT COST: \$16,328,700

DESCRIPTION: The District's Program consists of five groundwater recharge basins, surface water distribution and water management structure projects. The Program is needed to increase the groundwater recharge capabilities within the groundwater basin, facilitate additional storm water lay-off capacity and facilitate in-lieu groundwater recharge. The Program represents the District's effort to complete recharge basin projects for lands currently owned by the District. The western-most portion of the District does not have access to surface water supplies, nor a distribution system. The Program includes surface water distribution for a portion of the region. Finally, the Basin's primary water management structure is in need of repair and upgrade. The existing structure was constructed in 1938 and has approached the end of its useful life.

Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.

Pass

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1. 5

The applicant adopted an FED on July 5, 1995. Evidence of adoption is provided in Attachment 3 and an update is scheduled for completion in May 2006. The following local agencies have signed MOUs: Kaweah Delta Water Conservation District; California Water Service Company; the Cities of Tulare, Farmersville, and Visalia; Consolidated Peoples Ditch; Ivanhoe ID; Kings County WD; Lakeside Irrigation WD; Lakeside Ditch Company; St. Johns WD; and Tulare ID. The applicant is the lead agency in the MOUs, which were signed between 1996 and 2004.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1. 3

The applicant provided two reports that included a description of the area with maps showing the region encompassed by the FED. The map was difficult to read. The map did not show detail of where the projects were located, internal boundaries, or major water related infrastructure. The FED describes the current water demands, but it was difficult to find information on future water demands. The application needs an improved description of why the region is an appropriate area for water management; a discussion of the social, cultural, and economic conditions; and to better relate the individual projects together in a comprehensive, integrated effort.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1. 3

The FED objectives primarily address water supply and groundwater management issues. The FED is currently being updated and is scheduled for completion by May 2006. The applicant developed a study to investigate the feasibility of managing surface water and storm water for the benefit of the region's groundwater and biological resources. Over 10 years, the applicant sought feedback from stakeholders and related agency participants on the local, State, and federal levels. However, the applicant does not clearly describe how the objectives were determined or how they are regional in nature.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1. 3

Water management strategies are listed for each of the objectives. However, the applicant does not provide a clear discussion of how these strategies work together and how integration achieves multiple benefits.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1. 3

The description of regional priorities was unclear. The applicant explains how the principle goal is to reduce the long-term groundwater level decline, but short-term goals are not clear. The applicant referred to the relationship between decision making and regional changes, but it was not clear how the sequence of projects would be altered based on implementation responses.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The applicant identifies specific projects and studies by which the FED will be implemented. However, the applicant needs to more clearly tie the projects together and show the linkages between projects. It was difficult to find clearly defined timelines and discussion of economic and technical feasibility.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The applicant did not state whether an evaluation of potential negative impacts was conducted. Attachment 3 mentions some impacts and benefits for specific projects; however the applicant did not explain the interregional benefits. Impacts to surface water quantity are described in Attachment 5, but unclear in Attachment 3. The discussion is somewhat scattered between the various attachments.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The applicant does a good job of defining the hydrologic base period, characterizing the aquifer types, and the potential for deep groundwater percolation. They include some monitoring results and data to support future actions. However, data gaps were not identified or discussed in enough detail for the projects as a whole. The FED did not appear to discuss the data, technical methods, or analyses used to select the water management strategies.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The applicant completed an inventory of existing data and discussed how the data is presented annually in the update of the FED. Data gaps were identified. However, there was no clear discussion of how data will support statewide data needs or be distributed to the public.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

2

In Attachment 5, the applicant states that it is financing current activities along with City of Visalia. However, the FED did not specifically identify beneficiaries of implementation of the proposal. Operation of the proposal was not included and maintenance was marginally addressed.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The local planning portion of this criterion is not apparent from the documents submitted. Attachment 5 discusses the relation to local planning in general. The FED does not discuss how the local planning agency documents relate to the IRWM water management strategies and the dynamics between the two levels of planning documents.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1.

3

Coordination is mentioned in the FED and described briefly in Attachment 5. The MOUs describe partnerships but the public participation element is only marginally addressed. The FED does not document the public outreach activities to individual stakeholder groups or address environmental justice concerns.

Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match.

Pass

Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

12

The facilities are designed to improve the water supply reliability and water use efficiency. The goals and objectives for the implementation projects are described. A description of how these projects relate to the FED is explained for the water management elements. The CEQA and NEPA status is described for each aspect of the proposal. The groundwater recharge basins are described individually. However, the scientific basis for every project contained in the proposal is not discussed and for the few discussed no detail was provided.

Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.

8

Project prioritization is included in the proposal. Following the ordered list of projects is a detailed justification of why each project received its particular ranking. The prioritization is based on the regional benefit, scope, and current status. However, the proposal was not sufficiently detailed to understand the relationship of the projects to the FED.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.

5

Attachment 6 gives cost estimates for total project costs for each of the seven projects. A detailed cost estimate summary table is shown in Attachment 7 for each of the seven projects. Each table shows requested grant amounts, cost match, and total project costs - broken down by task.

Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

5

The schedule appears reasonable and is included as Attachment 8. The schedule shows items which are not part of the funding request, and is helpful to see how the applicant plans to leverage other resources to complete the proposed projects. The schedule shows the sequence and timing for implementation of each project.

Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.

8

The groundwater overdraft, water quality, and economic impacts were described well. However, the applicant did not describe other negative impacts if the proposal was not completed.

Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.

6

The applicant provides information on DACs including population and MHI data. They state that approximately 51 % of the population within the region is considered disadvantaged. The applicant is not applying for a cost share waiver. Two projects (#6 Delta View and #7 McKay Point) will provide some direct benefits to DACs by increasing groundwater recharge. The City of Visalia is described to be a direct benefactor from the recharge efforts. However, there is limited discussion to support the nature of the benefits.

Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The proposal meets the Program Preferences for multiple benefits and regional and local water supply reliability. The multiple benefits include flood water control, groundwater recharge, and riparian habitat development. More detail is needed in this section.

TOTAL SCORE: 82
